REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

Claims 25-29, and 34 were previously pending and under consideration.

Claims 35-37 are added herein.

Therefore, claims 25-29 and 34-37 are now pending and under consideration.

Claims 25-29, and 24 are rejected.

Claim 25 is amended herein.

No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 102

In the Office Action, at pages 1-3, claims 25-29 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Judge. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

STRUCTURAL DIFFERENCES

DMS Server Is Not Equivalent to a Shared Memory of a Workstation/Terminal

Claim 25 recites "using an ... (API) to enable a healthcare system (HCS) ... to access a document management system (DMS) server managing patient documents and making them available for access by plural user terminals".

The feature cited above indicates that the DMS server of the present claims is a central shared resource accessed by plural user terminals; e.g. a server. It appears that the rejection has broadly interpreted the meaning of a "document management system". The term "system" alone can have a broad meaning. Applicant respectfully submits that if the term "Document Management System" is interpreted in view of the specification and the entirety of the claims, it will be understood by one in the art to be a server-type system centrally available to user terminals or clients to access the managed documents. This meaning would be understood with reference to the claims because the DMS was previously recited as "managing patient

documents", receiving "a request to locate a document", and having an authentication aspect.

Claim 25 has been amended only to clarify the previously understood meaning, in light of the specification and claims, that the DMS is a document server. The shared memory of Judge is not a "server managing patient documents and making them available for access by plural user terminals". Rather, the shared memory is a low-level resource (a buffer) managed by an operating system and rendered usable for local applications by the API and PCI.

User Interface

Claim 1 recites "a user interface control" that receives user input and which is used to navigate a document from the DMS server. The Free Online Dictionary of Computing (foldoc.org) indicates that a "user interface" can be "[t]he aspects of a computer system or program which can be seen (or heard or otherwise perceived) by the human user, and the commands and mechanisms the user uses to control its operation and input data."

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to identify the portion of Judge that is considered to be the equivalent of a user interface control for navigating a document from a DMS server.

FUNCTIONAL DIFFERENCES

User Authentication

The Free Online Dictionary of Computing also notes that "authentication" can mean "[t]he verification of the identity of a person or process." Authentication is a term of art that to describe a process of identifying a user. Claim 25 has been amended to clarify that the authentication is user authentication.

The rejection compares the authentication features of claim 25 to the validating and registering of an application in Judge. That is, Judge as relied on as disclosing a PCI_RegisterApplication() function that registers an application with its PCI. This function must be called prior to an application calling any other PCI function (col. 3, lines 7-9). Registration of an application differs from authentication of a user because registration is nothing more than entry of information regardless of its authenticity, and because a user is not comparable to an application. Furthermore, the validation of the PCI_RegisterApplication() function is nothing more than making sure the name of the application being registered (pointer *name) is both

unique and not null. Determining that the name of an application is valid is not the same as authenticating a user.

Also, the shared memory of Judge is not designed for or capable of authenticating a user. Even if it acted as a conduit for authentication information passing to other systems, it would not itself be performing an authentication function. See column 7, lines 5-15, which mention that when an application retrieves data from the shared buffer, the "[t]he PCI does not itself interpret the content of the data; it is the applications sharing the data that give particular meaning to the data". The shared memory of Judge is designed for purely local data sharing between two applications executing on a workstation, in which case authenticity does not appear to be of any concern. The API of Judge is a library only for providing an application with controlled and coordinated access to the local shared memory.

Automatic Authentication To DMS Server

Claim 25 also recites automatically "authenticating the user to the DMS server" based on the HCS user authentication process. Judge does not disclose user authentication in general, and it also lacks authenticating a user on one system and using that authentication as a basis for user authentication on a DMS server.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The dependent claims are deemed patentable due at least to their dependence from allowable independent claims. These claims are also patentable due to their recitation of independently distinguishing features. For example, claim 29 recites "automatically authenticating to the DMS comprises the API automatically logging the user to the document management system using the log-on information from the user interface". This feature is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Registering an application is not comparable to logging a user onto a system. Again, the Free Online Dictionary of Computing indicates that "login", "log on" etc. is a term of art that indicates (emphasis added):

7

> To start a session with a system, usually by giving a user name and password as a means of user authentication. The term is also used to mean the ability to access a service (also called an account), e.g. "Have you been given a login yet?"
>
> "Log in/on" is occasionally misused to refer to <u>starting a session where no authorisation is involved</u>, or to access where there is no session involved. E.g. "Log on to our Web site!"

The definition above is similar to most other definitions of "logon", "login", and the like. It is respectfully submitted that no logon/authorization type processing is disclosed or suggested by Judge. Registering an application with shared memory in Judge does not involve any authorization or user log-on process.

Withdrawal of the rejection of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

OTHER CLAIM CHANGES

The first element of claim 25 is amended only to clarify that the interface control may or may not be part of the API. This element has not been narrowed. The fourth element of claim 25 has been amended to include "managed at the DMS server" to emphasize, as previously recited in the preamble, that the document management function is performed at the DMS server.

NEW CLAIMS

Regarding the dependent claims added herein, Judge does not disclose chart deficiencies or user access to data based on security privileges.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 18 March 2004

By: _James Strom_
James T. Strom
Registration No. 48,702

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501